"Applied Construction Grammar"

De Knop, Sabine ; Gilquin, Gaëtanelle

Abstract

Current research within the framework of Construction Grammar has mainly adopted a theoretical or descriptive approach, neglecting the more applied perspective, and especially the question of how language acquisition and pedagogy can benefit from a CxG-based approach. The present volume explores various aspects of the field of “Applied Construction Grammar”, through a collection of studies that apply Construction Grammar (CxG) and CxG-inspired approaches to relevant issues in L2 acquisition and teaching. Relying on empirical data and covering a wide range of constructions and languages, the chapters show how the cross-fertilization of CxG and L2 acquisition/teaching can lead to new theoretical insights and improved pedagogical practices. Applied Construction Grammar can improve the description of learners’ use of constructions, provide theoretical insights into the processes underlying their acquisition (e.g. with reference to inheritance links or transfer from the L1), or le...

Document type : *Monographie (Book)*

To appear in Sabine De Knop & Gaëtanelle Gilquin (eds) 2016. *Applied Construction Grammar* [Applications of Cognitive Linguistics 32]. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Exploring L2 constructionist approaches

Gaëtanelle Gilquin and Sabine De Knop

1. The need for an Applied Construction Grammar

The notion of Construction Grammar (CxG) covers a wide range of theoretical models (see Hoffmann and Trousdale (2013: 109-252) for an overview), all of them sharing the central tenet that constructions are the basic units of language. The interest for constructionist approaches to language started with Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor's (1988) seminal paper on *let alone* and received its first book-length treatment in Goldberg's (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. In this book, Goldberg describes constructions as conventionalized form-meaning pairs characterized by non-compositionality. In her later book *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language* (Goldberg 2006), the property of non-compositionality no longer constitutes a necessary condition to recognize constructions, as long as these structures are entrenched, i.e. characterized by frequency. In the last few years, CxG has gradually grown into a powerful descriptive and processing model which is now well-accepted in the scientific world, as attested by the organization of international events focussing on different issues related to CxG, as well as the publication of monographs and edited volumes describing the advantages (and limitations) of the constructionist models and the new insights they have provided, in English and more recently in other languages (see among others Fried and Östman 2004; Östman and Fried 2005; Fischer and Stefanowitsch 2007; Stefanowitsch and Fischer 2008; Lasch and Ziem 2011, 2014; Bouveret and Legallois 2012; Boas and Gonzálvez-García 2014).

Current research within the framework of CxG has mainly adopted a theoretical or descriptive approach, focussing on the principles of CxG, comparing it with other linguistic theories (e.g. valency theory, cf. Herbst and Stefanowitsch 2011; Welke 2011), describing specific constructions (e.g. the well-known caused motion construction or the ditransitive construction), or illustrating some of the CxG principles at work in constructions in different languages (e.g. Boas 2010; De Knop, Mollica, and Kuhn 2013). One perspective that has been relatively neglected up to now is the more applied perspective, and especially the question of how language acquisition and pedagogy can benefit from a CxG-based approach. Child language acquisition fares slightly better in this respect. Probably under the impetus of usage-based models of CxG, which hold that constructions gradually emerge from actual usage events and that language is thus learned inductively, the processes underlying the acquisition of a first language have received some attention in the literature (e.g. Goldberg, Casenhiser, and Sethuraman 2004; Tomasello 2006; Diessel 2013). Second and foreign language (L2) acquisition and teaching, on the other hand, have not been the focus of many CxG-based studies so far.

Among the few authors who have tackled L2 acquisition from a CxG point of view, Liang (2002, quoted in Goldberg 2006) is probably one of the earliest examples. Her study is a replication of Bencini and Goldberg's (2000) sentence-sorting experiment, which showed that American students favour construction over verb when sorting sentences (argument structure constructions) into different groups according to their overall meaning. Liang's (2002) subjects are not native speakers of English, but Chinese learners of English. Not only does it appear that the Chinese

learners do sort by construction, but it also turns out that constructional sorts vary along with language proficiency: the more proficient the learners, the more likely they are to use constructional meaning as the main criterion for sorting the stimulus sentences. Gries and Wulff (2005) propose another replication of Bencini and Goldberg (2000) with advanced German learners of English. Their results, which are very similar to those obtained by Liang (2002) for the most advanced Chinese learners, indicate a preference for construction-based sorting over verb-based sorting. In fact, the foreign language learners appear to rely even more heavily on constructional sorts than the native speakers in Bencini and Goldberg's (2000) experiment, an outcome that could suggest that constructions are even more crucial for non-native speakers than for native speakers when it comes to the interpretation of sentences. Gries and Wulff's (2005) study also includes a sentence completion task and a (native) corpus analysis, both of which confirm the relevance of "attributing an ontological status to constructions for non-native speakers of English" (Gries and Wulff 2005: 182). In 2009, using the same combination of psycholinguistic evidence (acceptability rating task and sentence completion task) and corpus linguistic evidence (from native corpus data), Gries and Wulff provide additional support for the ontological status of constructions for German learners of English, this time exploring complementation constructions rather than argument structure constructions. Valenzuela Manzanares and Rojo López (2008) adopt a similar approach: they combine a replication of Bencini and Goldberg's (2000) experiment, an acceptability judgment task and a corpus analysis to demonstrate the psychological reality of constructions for yet another learner population, namely Spanish learners of English. What is particularly interesting about their methodology is that, unlike Gries and Wulff, they supplement the native corpus analysis with the investigation of learner corpus data, on the basis of which they examine learners' performance, identify their phraseological preferences, and also create anomalous stimulus sentences for the acceptability judgment task. These studies are important because they provide converging evidence that learners from different mother tongue (L1) backgrounds and different proficiency levels have some mental representation of various constructions, just like native speakers. This, of course, is a sine qua non for a constructionist approach to second and foreign languages: if non-native speakers do not (and cannot) have constructions, then a theoretical framework relying on constructions as the basic building blocks of language cannot be suitable for the description and analysis of an L2, while from a teaching point of view, "if constructions were not a psychologically real category, learners would profit very little from their inclusion in any learning materials" (Eddington and Ruiz de Mendoza 2010: 230).

Once the existence of constructions in L2 has been demonstrated, their use by learners can be analysed. Strictly speaking, since CxG models tend to consider that all language consists in constructions (morphemes, words, phrases, idioms, etc.), all previous investigations of L2 can be said to contribute to our knowledge of the L2 constructicon. However, we are interested here in studies that explicitly adopt a CxG approach and take advantage of the strengths of the theory to gain a better understanding of the processes underlying second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Gilquin's (2015) study of phrasal verbs, for example, starts from the CxG view that constructions exist at different levels of abstraction and form networks in the constructicon. It examines the use of phrasal verbs by French-speaking learners of English at three levels, from the more abstract to the more specific: the phrasal verb "superconstruction", the structural patterns [V Prt], [V Prt OBJ] and [V OBJ Prt] (where V = verb, Prt = particle, OBJ = object), and the

lexically specified phrasal verbs. A comparison of (spoken and written) learner corpus data with a native baseline reveals that it is at the intermediate level, that of the structural patterns, that learners seem to be the most successful and thus, presumably, have best internalized the construction. Among other methods of analysis, the study relies on the technique of collostructional analysis, which measures the interaction between words and constructions (Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003). This technique, which reconciles CxG and (quantitative) corpus linguistics, has been applied in other investigations of L2 constructions, for example verb-argument constructions (Ellis and Ferreira-Junior 2009a), causative constructions (Gilquin 2012), or gerundial and infinitival constructions (Martinez-Garcia and Wulff 2012). Ellis and Ferreira-Junior (2009a: 203) note that, for verb-argument constructions, native collexeme strength, i.e. the strength of association between the constructions and the verbs occurring in them, as calculated by a collostructional analysis, "is a very strong predictor of NNS [non-native speaker] acquisition". This comment underlines the relevance of collostructional analysis for second language acquisition, but even more importantly, it shows that, beyond a simple description of non-native language, a CxG-based approach also makes it possible to predict and/or explain certain features of the interlanguage. A case in point is the presence of L1 traces in the use of L2 constructions, due to transfer from the L1 to the L2. Martínez Vázquez (2008) thus finds out that caused motion constructions, which are typical of satellite-framed languages (like English) but not verb-framed languages, occur more and with more diversity in the English essays of learners with a satellite-framed L1 than in those of learners with a verb-framed L1. Similarly, Römer, O'Donnell, and Ellis (2014), examining the responses to generative free association tasks, attribute differences between native and non-native English verb-argument constructions to language transfer and typology: "learners whose L1 is satellite-framed (and hence typologically similar to English) produce more verbs that correlate more closely with those produced by L1 English speakers than speakers whose L1 is verb-framed" (Römer, O'Donnell, and Ellis 2014: 967). Such phenomena are due to the fact that, when learning an L2, learners come with their own constructicon, which may interfere with the L2 constructicon. All this goes to show that second language acquisition, unlike first language acquisition, "involves processes of construction and *re*construction" (Ellis 2013: 366; emphasis original). These processes are determined by factors like construction frequency, form, function, and the interactions between these elements (Ellis 2013: 368ff.). Some of these factors are further investigated in two special issues of journals edited by Collins and Ellis (2009) and by Ellis and Cadierno (2009).

The authors of several of the above-mentioned studies briefly discuss some teaching implications of their findings. Thus, it is suggested that L2 instruction should "acknowledge the pervasiveness of constructions more than it currently does" (Römer, O'Donnell, and Ellis 2014: 967), that the description of constructions in teaching materials should better reflect actual usage (Martinez-Garcia and Wulff 2012: 240), that learners should be made aware of typical associations between words and constructions (Martinez-Garcia and Wulff 2012: 241) as well as differences between L1 and L2 constructions (Römer, O'Donnell, and Ellis 2014: 967), or that teachers defining the objectives of their teaching or preparing exercises for their students should use the results of CxG studies of interlanguage to "determine the stage of the students' learning process, locate their main problems and establish their needs" (Valenzuela Manzanares and Rojo López 2008: 223). While such suggestions are typically found in the conclusion section, as a kind of afterthought, a few publications are entirely devoted to the issue of applying CxG to language teaching, e.g. Wee

(2007) or Holme (2010a, 2010b). Holme (2010a) stresses the important role of teaching in a CxG-based view of second language acquisition. Since, according to CxG (and usage-based models in general), constructions are generalized from the different instantiations that are encountered in language, generalizations might be more difficult to make for non-native speakers, who get exposed to fewer instantiations. Teaching, therefore, should compensate for this low exposure and implement strategies that encourage learners to generalize (Holme 2010a: 126). This could involve the repeated exposure to – and noticing of – various instantiations of a construction in different contexts, through the use of texts that "recycle new tokens of previously taught constructions" (Holme 2010a: 127). These educationalists who believe in the power of CxG for language teaching particularly emphasize the potential of "scaffolding" (Wee 2007: 29; Holme 2010a: 127). Their claim is that, starting from the use of a pathbreaking verb in a construction, learners can discover (or be made to discover) how the pathbreaking verb alternates with other verbs, how the construction relates to other constructions that the learner is familiar with (in the target language or in another language, including the mother tongue) – e.g. constructions that are embedded within the construction or represent a semantic extension of it – and how the productivity of constructions can be exploited for creative purposes. In other words, students should learn to "conceptualise the new through the known" (Holme 2010b: 362). Gradually, thanks to the presentation of language material "in a meaningful and logical, systematically structured way" (Pavlović 2010: 85), they should be able to build networks of constructions that will help them store constructions more efficiently in their mental constructicon and retrieve the information more rapidly. This approach is all the more interesting as it can be applied to "language elements of all shapes and sizes" (Hinkel 2012: 4), since CxG is a "uniform model of grammatical representation" (Pedersen and Cadierno 2004: 155) that recognizes constructions at all levels of language. Most of these pedagogical suggestions, though perfectly sensible from a theoretical point of view, have not been tested with real students, and we know very little about their possible teaching effectiveness. One exception to this is Holme's (2010b) description and evaluation of two CxG-based pedagogical interventions in a secondary school. By comparing the results of a pre- and post-test among the experimental group of students who participated in the pedagogical interventions and a control group who did not, he shows that the experimental group improved their score significantly more than the control group. This study thus provides modest but encouraging evidence that constructionist approaches have a role to play in the classroom.

This literature review shows that the main issues related to L2 applications of CxG have been tackled, namely the ontological status of constructions, the analysis of their use and acquisition, and the pedagogical implications of a constructionist approach to second language acquisition and foreign language learning. However, given the small number of publications to date, the findings are necessarily limited – in terms of research questions, constructions, languages or learner populations investigated – which makes it difficult to draw wide-ranging and reliable conclusions about the relevance of CxG for second language acquisition research. Yet, the above studies, by providing interesting insights into the learning and teaching of constructions, have demonstrated the potential of using CxG for applied purposes. What is needed at this stage, therefore, is a continued and collaborative effort to pursue research in this field, which we will refer to as "Applied Construction Grammar" and which, adapting Pütz's (2007: 1139) definition of Applied Cognitive Linguistics, we will define as the acquisitional and pedagogical implications of

Construction Grammar in second/foreign language teaching and learning. The present volume is a first attempt at bringing together different contributions that explore the various aspects of Applied Construction Grammar. In the next section, we present the volume and describe the main issues related to second language acquisition, foreign language learning and teaching that are addressed in its eleven chapters.

2. Main issues in second language acquisition, foreign language learning and teaching

The aim of this volume is to offer a collection of studies applying CxG (and CxG-inspired approaches) to relevant issues in second language acquisition, foreign language learning and teaching. As "[c]onstructions form a structured inventory of a speaker's knowledge" (Ellis and Ferreira-Junior 2009b: 370), it will come as no surprise that the contributions to the volume all take "constructions" as a starting point for their studies. However, the notion of construction is used and defined in various and more or less general ways in the volume. Most chapters follow Goldberg's (1995, 2006) definition and agree that constructions are form-meaning mappings. Goldberg's (1995) early defining property of constructions as having to be non-compositional does not represent an obligatory characteristic of the constructions as described in the volume. Entrenchment in a specific language is what primarily defines them. The volume offers a detailed description of a variety of constructions, mainly in English (resultative construction, caused motion construction, causative construction, subjective-manipulative construction, dative alternation), but also in other languages: the German ditransitive construction, the Spanish and Danish caused motion construction, the Spanish planned future periphrasis [*ir a* + infinitive] ('*go to* + infinitive') and iterative periphrasis [*volver a* + infinitive] ('*return to* + infinitive'), or the Swedish [X *och* X] ('X *and* X') construction. Like cognitive linguistics and other usage-based models of language, CxG can be seen as a "data-friendly" theory (Janda 2013: 2), and the last few years in particular have seen a greater reliance on empirical evidence among constructionists. Accordingly, all the studies brought together in this volume use some sort of data. Some of these come from corpora representing naturally-occurring language, either L1 production or L2 production; in some cases the corpus data are merely used to illustrate certain phenomena, but in other cases they constitute the foundation on which the whole analysis is built. Experimentation is also used as a source of data and includes sorting tasks, (picture-based or video-based) description tasks, translation tasks and priming experiments. This empirical orientation helps improve the reliability of the claims made.

The volume is divided into three main sections. The first one deals with constructionist approaches to L2 learning and teaching. The four chapters in this section examine how L2 use and acquisition appear through the CxG looking glass, and what consequences this can have for language teaching. In the second section, the focus is on crosslinguistic applications. The comparison between languages lies at the basis of the four chapters making up the section. However, this comparison is not an end in itself, but a way of gaining deeper insights into second language acquisition/foreign language learning, most notably through the idea of constructional transfer. The three chapters of the last section deal with the construction of constructicons for learners, i.e. databases of constructions meant to help learners acquire the main constructions of a language. Despite this neat division into three sections, it should be noted that there is a certain degree of overlap between the topics

they cover, with, for example, teaching suggestions being found in the crosslinguistic applications, and crosslinguistic issues arising in the description of constructicons. In what follows, we identify some of the more specific topics that are discussed across the volume.

2.1. Learners' constructions

If constructions are the basic units of language, then the question can be asked whether language learners have constructions in their L2 and, if so, how they acquire them, and whether these constructions are acquired in the same way by native and non-native speakers or by non-native speakers from different mother tongue backgrounds. In her empirical study of the dative alternation, which replicates Hare and Goldberg's (1999) experiment, Baicchi provides some evidence that Italian learners of English do have constructions in their L2, even in cases where the construction does not have any counterpart in the L1 constructicon (cf. double-object construction and fulfilling construction, which are not part of the Italian language). De Knop and Mollica come to a similar conclusion with their sorting experiment of phraseological ditransitive constructions. In their study they observe that French- and Italian-speaking learners of German intuitively prefer to sort literal and phraseological ditransitive constructions according to their structure, rather than according to the verb type, the valency of the verbs or the lexemes used in these constructions. This seems to suggest that constructional templates are present in learners' interlanguage.

However, due to typological differences, languages may have different constructions and different constructional properties, as illustrated by Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Agustín Llach's contrastive analysis of the resultative, caused motion and subjective-manipulative constructions in Spanish and English. Hijazo-Gascón, Cadierno, and Ibarretxe-Antuñano also highlight the typological differences between placement caused motion constructions in Danish and Spanish, which are realized with a placement verb and a satellite in Danish, while in Spanish only a general *put*-verb is required. Such differences are likely to affect learners' representations of the constructions in the L2 and lead to possible transfer effects, as outlined in the next section.

2.2. Transfer of L1 constructions to L2

If we postulate cross-linguistically different constructions due, among other things, to typological differences, we may wonder whether constructions are transferred from L1 to L2 and whether certain constructions are more prone to transfer than others. Della Putta's study of the difficulties encountered by Spanish speakers when trying to express planned future and iteration in Italian (which cannot use the literal equivalents of the Spanish constructions) reveals that L1 constructions can indeed be transferred to L2. Della Putta even goes one step further by claiming that some L1 constructions function as an obstacle to the learning of an L2, which leads him to develop several teaching activities to "unlearn" the L1 constructions. Similarly, Hijazo-Gascón, Cadierno, and Ibarretxe-Antuñano observe possible traces of transfer (including semantic transfer) in Danish learners' use of the Spanish placement caused motion construction.

Yet, we are also reminded that transfer is by no means systematic. Hijazo-Gascón, Cadierno, and Ibarretxe-Antuñano point out that their Danish learners use fewer particle tokens in the Spanish placement caused motion construction than the

native speakers, despite the fact that the Danish construction frequently includes a particle. As for De Knop and Mollica, they note that learners are not always able to select the correct meaning of ditransitive phraseologisms, even when the L1 and the L2 use the same image (e.g. the image of the shoulder to express rejection in German and Italian). These cases of non-transfer, as explained by the authors, could be due to learners' perceptions of the L1 and L2 constructions (cf. Kellerman's (1978) concept of psychotypology).

2.3. Constructionist view on L2 acquisition

CxG belongs to the usage-based approaches which emphasize that languages are learnt from usage, through abstraction and generalization. As pointed out in Herbst's chapter, such generalizations are arguably more difficult to make in L2 acquisition because of the smaller amount of input received by non-native speakers. On the other hand, Herbst notes that the presence of similar generalizations in the L1 may have a facilitative effect for learners. As will be shown in Section 2.4, teaching may also counterbalance learners' input-poor environment.

Not all learners live in an input-poor environment, however. A distinction can be drawn between learners who mainly learn the target language through instruction (i.e. with a limited amount of input) and those who acquire the language in a natural environment. Gilquin compares the use of English causative constructions by two groups of students representing these different acquisition contexts and shows that students with more exposure to naturally-occurring language tend to have a more native-like knowledge of the constructions. The amount of input also seems to influence the level at which learners generalize: a more abstract level for learners who receive more input and a lower, more concrete level for learners who receive less input and more instruction.

Another observation is that light verbs are central to the learning of constructions. The chapters by Gilquin and by Hijazo-Gascón, Cadierno, and Ibarretxe-Antuñano show that learners' constructions tend to be characterized by over-reliance on such verbs, and in particular the high-frequency verb *make* in English causative constructions and the general placement verb *poner* ('put') in Spanish placement caused motion constructions. Sung and Yang demonstrate that light verbs facilitate the learning of the constructions in which they occur. The use of these verbs could thus be the first step in the acquisition of constructions, a step that is necessary before more specific verbs can gradually come to be associated with the constructions.

2.4. CxG-inspired teaching strategies

Some of the contributions start by expressing dissatisfaction with the traditional teaching methodology as applied in certain teaching manuals. According to Loenheim et al., Swedish L2 textbooks and study aid materials tend to neglect semi-general patterns and fail to capture the productivity and variability of constructions. In his analysis of Bavarian teaching manuals, Herbst draws a similar conclusion after observing that the terminology is not clear and sometimes even obsolete, and that some examples are contradictory. Dictionaries are of little help as they rarely provide information about the constructions in which words typically occur. Cappelle and Grabar stress that foreign language teaching is in dire need of an inventory of frequent constructions which can be considered relevant when learning an L2 (see Section 2.5). A major problem in traditional teaching methodology seems to be the (commonly

used) dichotomy between lexicon and grammar, which entails that learners and teachers can either gain knowledge about words as listed in dictionaries/lexicons, or structural knowledge as described in grammar books. Only few teaching materials combine both knowledge areas in a constructive way.

With the demonstration of the ontological status of constructions in the L2, and hence their psychological reality for learners, Baicchi claims that it is highly advisable to introduce constructions in language pedagogy. According to Herbst, linguistics, and more specifically CxG, could help determine what to teach and how to teach it. For him, the most important asset of CxG is that it provides a cognitive perspective that is compatible with other approaches like corpus linguistics or foreign language linguistics, with which it shares many central concerns. This affinity makes CxG an ideal theory for language teaching applications. Taking a contrastive point of view, Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Agustín Llach suggest that pedagogical grammarians should provide learners with user-friendly versions of the generalizations that they should ultimately arrive at, and that these generalizations should be contrasted with their counterparts in the learners' L1. The authors themselves develop some very concrete pedagogical activities in their chapter, based for example on inferential activity and construction-based meaning composition.

Sung and Yang offer supporting evidence for the effectiveness of CxG-inspired pedagogical interventions. Using a translation task as a pre- and post-test, they show that Korean learners of English who have received construction-centred instruction improve their score more than learners who have received form-centred instruction. It also appears from their experiment that teaching a construction may positively affect the learning of directly related – and more basic – constructions, a point which is taken up again in the next section.

2.5. Elaboration of a constructicon

One of the characteristics of CxG is that it does not view constructions in isolation, but as forming networks or, as Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Agustín Llach call them, families of constructions. Taking advantage of this, De Knop and Mollica study ditransitive phraseologisms starting from the literal ditransitive constructions. The relation between the phraseological and the literal constructions is motivated by inheritance links defined in CxG. Such links can be exploited for teaching purposes, as suggested by Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Agustín Llach, who recommend teaching constructions in relation to other similar constructions (e.g. the English caused motion construction and its sister resultative constructions). The above-mentioned study by Sung and Yang demonstrates that the teaching of the transitive resultative construction can help improve learners' knowledge of other related constructions, especially the caused motion construction, which directly dominates the transitive resultative construction in the hierarchical network of argument structure constructions.

Using a large corpus from which part-of-speech n-grams are automatically extracted, Cappelle and Grabar aim to compile a list of the most frequent grammatical patterns in English and the lexical items commonly found in these patterns. The authors regard this list as the basis of an "n-grammar", in which abstract patterns are described, illustrated, and practised through, e.g., "chop and change charts". As for the chapters by Boas, Dux, and Ziem, on the one hand, and Loenheim et al., on the other, they describe the elaboration of a constructicon for German and Swedish, respectively. More precisely, Boas, Dux, and Ziem introduce the so-called German

Frame-Based Online Lexicon (G-FOL), a frame- and construction-based resource relying on the principles of FrameNet. G-FOL seeks to provide English-speaking learners of German with useful lexical and grammatical information, as illustrated in the chapter for grooming events. German constructions and their "constructional elements" are described and exemplified by means of corpus sentences, and comparisons with their English equivalents are presented. Like Boas, Dux, and Ziem, Loenheim et al. see in the elaboration of their Swedish constructicon (SweCcn, also connected to FrameNet) a way of bringing together the general rules of grammar and the concrete lexical expressions of dictionaries. Through what they call constructicography, they hope to bring a constructional perspective to language education and to open up the possibility of developing construction-based teaching materials.

3. Conclusion and outlook

Combined with the already existing literature reviewed in Section 1, the contributions to this volume underline the advantages of approaching second language acquisition and foreign language learning and teaching from a constructionist point of view. Besides confirming the existence of constructions in learners' minds, Applied Construction Grammar can improve the description of learners' use of constructions, provide theoretical insights into the processes underlying their acquisition (e.g. with reference to inheritance links or transfer from the L1), or lead to novel teaching practices and resources aimed to help learners make the generalizations that native speakers make naturally from the input they receive. It will probably come as a relief to certain readers that adopting such a perspective does not necessarily mean that one has to do away with former beliefs or pedagogical materials and start something completely new. On the one hand, Applied Construction Grammar appears to be compatible with other frameworks, such as corpus linguistics or contrastive linguistics, as well as, obviously, the general theory of cognitive linguistics and all usage-based models. On the other hand, small adjustments are sometimes sufficient to make one's approach to L2 acquisition and teaching, if not truly constructionist, at least CxG-inspired, as suggested by Herbst's seven principles for Pedagogical Construction Grammar.

At the same time, it must be admitted that there is still a great deal of research to be carried out if we want Applied Construction Grammar to grow into a mature and fully-fledged discipline. Many more constructions, groups of learners and contexts of acquisition will have to be examined before a comprehensive constructionist theory of L2 acquisition can be developed. This will require more and new types of experimentation and corpus analyses, which might involve access to data that are perhaps not yet available, like for example dense longitudinal corpora representing several learner populations that would make it possible to chart the emergence of constructions in L2 acquisition (cf. Ellis 2013: 377). In terms of teaching, rigorously controlled classroom experimentation will be essential before we introduce CxG across the board in our schools. If they turn out to be efficient (for certain groups of learners), CxG-based pedagogical interventions will have to be created, and then probably refined as theoretical developments continue to be made. The conservative forces of the publishing industry will also have to be overcome if we are to make CxG-inspired teaching materials widely available (see Herbst's chapter) – even if we must recognize with Littlemore (2009: 173) that "we have a long way to go before we

can produce suitable materials to introduce learners to L2 constructions and the relationships between them in a realistic, systematic and learnable manner". From a more theoretical viewpoint, it would be worth investigating whether the other models of CxG are as suitable as the Goldbergian model mainly considered here for applied purposes. It might be that, after such an investigation, the field of Applied Construction Grammar should be renamed "Applied Construction Grammars".

The above shows that many aspects of Applied Construction Grammar remain to be explored. However, the clear potential of the field augurs well for the future. More synergy between CxG and second language acquisition/foreign language teaching is likely to bring them mutual benefit: second language acquisition and foreign language teaching can develop their theoretical insights about L2 learning and propose new ways of teaching languages, while CxG can test the plausibility of its theories through the confrontation with more applied issues. We hope that this prospect, as well as the example of the contributions collected in this volume, can encourage both constructionists and L2 acquisition/teaching specialists to dig deeper into Applied Construction Grammar and foster its development for our and our students' benefit.

References

Bencini, Giulia M. L. & Adele E. Goldberg. 2000. The contribution of argument structure constructions to sentence meaning. *Journal of Memory and Language* 43(4). 640–651.

Boas, Hans C. (ed.). 2010. *Contrastive studies in construction grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Boas, Hans C. & Francisco Gonzálvez-García (eds.). 2014. *Romance perspectives on construction grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bouveret, Myriam & Dominique Legallois (eds.). 2012. *Constructions in French.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Collins, Laura & Nick Ellis (eds.). 2009. *Input and second language construction learning: Frequency, form, and function*. Special issue of *The Modern Language Journal* 93(3). 329-429.

De Knop, Sabine, Fabio Mollica & Julia Kuhn (eds.). 2013. *Konstruktionsgrammatik in den Romanischen Sprachen*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Diessel, Holger. 2013. Construction grammar and first language acquisition. In Thomas Hoffmann & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 347-364. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eddington, David & Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza. 2010. Argument constructions and language processing: Evidence from a priming experiment and pedagogical implications. In Sabine De Knop, Frank Boers & Antoon De Rycker (eds.), *Fostering language teaching efficiency through cognitive linguistics*, 213–238. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ellis, Nick. 2013. Construction grammar and second language acquisition. In Thomas Hoffmann & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 365-378. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Nick & Teresa Cadierno (eds.). 2009. *Constructing a second language*. Special section of *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 111-290.

Ellis, Nick & Fernando Ferreira-Junior. 2009a. Constructions and their acquisition. Islands and the distinctiveness of their occupancy. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 187-220.

Ellis, Nick & Fernando Ferreira-Junior. 2009b. Construction learning as a function of frequency, frequency distribution, and function. *The Modern Language Journal* 93(3). 370-385.

Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay & Mary Catherine O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of 'let alone'. *Language* 64(3). 501-538.

Fischer, Kerstin & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.). 2007. *Konstruktionsgrammatik: Von der Anwendung zur Theorie.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Fried, Mirjam & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.). 2004. *Construction grammar in a cross-language perspective*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gilquin, Gaëtanelle. 2012. Lexical infelicity in English causative constructions. Comparing native and learner collostructions. In Jaakko Leino & Ruprecht von Waldenfels (eds.), *Analytical causatives. From 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*, 41-63. München: Lincom Europa.

Gilquin, Gaëtanelle. 2015. The use of phrasal verbs by French-speaking EFL learners. A constructional and collostructional corpus-based approach. In Sabine De Knop & Fanny Meunier (eds.), *Learner corpus research, cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. Special issue of *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 11(1). 51-88.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions. A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work. The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, Adele E., Devin M. Casenhiser & Nitya Sethuraman. 2004. Learning argument structure generalizations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 14(3). 289–316.

Gries, Stefan Th. & Stefanie Wulff. 2005. Do foreign language learners also have constructions? Evidence from priming, sorting, and corpora. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 3. 182-200.

Gries, Stefan Th. & Stefanie Wulff. 2009. Psycholinguistic and corpus-linguistic evidence for L2 constructions. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 163-186.

Hare, Mary & Adele E. Goldberg. 1999. Structural priming: Purely syntactic? In Martin Hahn & Scott Stones (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st annual meeting of the cognitive science society*, 208-211. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Herbst, Thomas & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.). 2011. *Argument structure – Valency and/or constructions?* Special issue of *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 59.

Hinkel, Eli. 2012. Innovative and efficient construction grammar. *Selected papers from the 21st international symposium on English teaching.* English Teachers' Association, Republic of China (ETA-ROC), Taipei. Available at http://www.elihinkel.org/downloads/innovative-efficient-grammar.pdf (last accessed on 10 August 2015).

Hoffmann, Thomas & Graeme Trousdale (eds.). 2013. *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holme, Randal. 2010a. Construction grammars: Towards a pedagogical model. *AILA Review* 23. 115-133.

Holme, Randal. 2010b. A construction grammar for the classroom. *IRAL* 48. 355-377.

Janda, Laura A. 2013. Quantitative methods in *Cognitive Linguistics*: An introduction. In Laura A. Janda (ed.), *Cognitive linguistics: The quantitative turn. The essential reader*, 1-32. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kellerman, Eric. 1978. Transfer and non-transfer: Where are we now? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 2. 37-57.

Lasch, Alexander & Alexander Ziem (eds.). 2011. *Konstruktionsgrammatik III. Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Lasch, Alexander & Alexander Ziem (eds.). 2014. *Grammatik als Netzwerk von Konstruktionen - Sprachwissen im Fokus der Konstruktionsgrammatik.* Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Liang, Junying. 2002. How do Chinese EFL learners construct sentence meaning: Verb-centered or construction-based? M.A. thesis, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.

Littlemore, Jeannette. 2009. *Applying cognitive linguistics to second language learning and teaching.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martinez-Garcia, Maria Teresa & Stefanie Wulff. 2012. Not wrong, yet not quite right: Spanish ESL students' use of gerundial and infinitival complementation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 22(2). 225–244.

Martínez Vázquez, Montserrat. 2008. Constructions in learner language. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 36. 40-62.

Östman, Jan-Ola & Mirjam Fried (eds.). 2005. *Construction grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pavlović, Vladan. 2010. Cognitive linguistics and English language teaching at English departments. *Facta Universitatis, Series Linguistics and Literature* 8(1). 79-90.

Pedersen, Johan & Teresa Cadierno. 2004. Construction grammar and second language acquisition: A cognitive understanding of language in a contrastive perspective. In Hans Lauge Hansen (ed.), *Disciplines and interdisciplinarity in foreign language studies*, 151-167. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Pütz, Martin. 2007. Cognitive linguistics and applied linguistics. In Dirk Geeraerts & Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*, 1139-1159. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Römer, Ute, Matthew Brook O'Donnell & Nick C. Ellis. 2014. Second language learner knowledge of verb-argument constructions: Effects of language transfer and typology. *The Modern Language Journal* 98(4). 952–975.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Kerstin Fischer (eds.). 2008. *Konstruktionsgrammatik II: Von der Konstruktion zur Grammatik.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stefan Th. Gries. 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8(2). 209–243.

Tomasello, Michael. 2006. Construction grammar for kids. *Constructions* Special Volume 1. Available at http://www.constructions-journal.com.

Valenzuela Manzanares, Javier & Ana María Rojo López. 2008. What can language learners tell us about constructions? In Sabine De Knop & Teun De Rycker (eds.), *Cognitive approaches to pedagogical grammar: A volume in honour of René Dirven*, 197-230. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wee, Lionel. 2007. Construction grammar and English language teaching. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching* 3(1). 20-32.

Welke, Klaus. 2011. *Valenzgrammatik des Deutschen: Eine Einführung.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.